



Date: September 4, 2009

To: Patrick H. West, City Manager *P West*

From: Lori Ann Farrell, Director of Financial Management/CFO *LA*

For: Mayor and Members of the City Council

Subject: **Responses to Questions from the August 25, August 31, and September 1, 2009 Budget Workshops and Hearings**

Below are the questions raised by City Council members at the August 25, August 31, and September 1, 2009 Budget Workshops and Hearings. This memo provides responses to questions that were not answered on the floor.

August 25, 2009 Budget Workshop

- 1) Of the 52 FTEs with a base salary and skill pay totaling \$100,000 eliminated from the FY 10 Proposed Budget, how many were sworn vs. non-sworn.

Of the 52 positions, 48 were sworn.

Sworn (including managers)

Fire Department – 8.0 FTE

Police Department – 40.0 FTE

Non-sworn

4.0 FTE

- 2) Please provide a breakdown of the 2,784 current contracts for service the City is currently utilizing by department.

The contract breakdown by department is listed in Attachment A.

August 31, 2009 Budget Workshop

- 3) How is the Sustainability Office staff funded? What department and what percentage?

The Office of Sustainability staff are budgeted in the Development Services Department. With the reorganization in Development Services, three existing Development Services staff were re-purposed to take on new roles to coordinate sustainability initiatives citywide and implement model sustainability programs for the City. No new positions were created.

The Office of Sustainability's costs are funded by non-general fund sources and the chosen funds/operations are selected based on the nexus to citywide sustainability. These sources that have been asked to participate in funding include Public Works-Refuse, Gas & Oil, Harbor Department, Community Development-Workforce Development, Water Department (although they have yet to commit to participate) and

Development Services (through in-kind support). These Departments are charged based on the following percentages:

Department	Fund	Percentage
Public Works	Refuse	43.00%
Long Beach Gas & Oil	Gas/SERRF/Tidelands Oil	14.25%
Harbor	Harbor Operation	14.25%
Water	TBD	14.25%
CD – Workforce Development	Community Development Grants	14.25%

With the FY 10 funding, Long Beach will see the establishment of a Long Beach Green Business program, expansion of Operation Mulch-A-Lot, the creation of a Green Jobs program, the release of the City's second greenhouse gas emissions inventory, management of \$4.3 million in federal Stimulus funding and implementation of municipal energy efficiency retrofits, creation of a citywide sustainable landscape ordinance, additional green building program updates and the start-up of numerous pilot projects as a result of community partnerships. In addition, the Office of Sustainability staff will facilitate 11 Sustainable City Commission meetings, will staff all Environmental Committee Meetings, will facilitate internal green team meetings and associated training sessions, will participate in at least 4 major City events and will speak at approximately 25 neighborhood or community meetings throughout the year.

4) What is the status of the Citizen's Police Complaint Commission annual report?

A response was provided under separate cover on September 3, 2009.

5) What is the total cost of all contracts with our state and federal lobbyists?

Funds to support legislative representation at the federal, state and regional levels are budgeted in the City Manager's Office. The cost of federal and state legislative representation services in the City Manager's Office is shared by departments and funds throughout the City that benefit from these services, including many non-General Fund operations. More specifically, 53 percent of Government Affairs' expenses, including the legislative representation contracts, are funded by non-General Fund operations.

The firm of Michael J. Arnold and Associates has represented the City of Long Beach in Sacramento since 1983. The contract with Michael J. Arnold and Associates is \$105,432 (based on a monthly retainer of \$8,311, plus up to \$5,700 for approved expenses). Michael J. Arnold and Associates dedicates a total of three staff members to the City of Long Beach's issues.

The firm of Van Scoyoc Associates has represented the City of Long Beach in Washington, D.C., since January 2007. The City selected Van Scoyoc Associates as the most qualified firm after an extensive Request for Proposals process to seek proposals from professional consulting firms to provide federal legislative representation services. The contract with Van Scoyoc Associates is \$180,000 (based on a monthly retainer of \$13,000 and up to \$2,000 per month in approved expenses). Van Scoyoc Associates dedicates a total of five staff members to the City of Long Beach's issues.

- 6) Assuming in FY 10 property and sales tax remained at FY 09 levels, how would this scenario affect the City's fiscal health?

If the City's initial Property Tax and Sales Tax projections had not been impacted by the economic recession in FY 10, the current deficit of \$38.3 million would have been lessened by \$10.85 million to \$27.4 million.

- 7) Please detail the total amount of expenses related to City-sponsored parades.

For FY 10, there are six parades in Long Beach that receive approximately \$108,500 in City-support:

Parade	Fund	Expenditure Amount
Daisy Lane Parade	Special Advertising and Promotion (SR 133)	\$41,672
Martin Luther King, Jr. Parade	Special Advertising and Promotion (SR 133)	\$37,248
Veterans Day Parade	Special Advertising and Promotion (SR 133)	\$15,080
Belmont Shore Christmas Parade	Tidelands Operations (TF 401)	\$7,500
Naples Island Boat Parade	Tidelands Operations (TF 401)	\$5,000
Parade of 1,000 Lights	Tidelands Operations (TF 401)	\$2,000
TOTAL		\$108,500

- 8) Do the cuts to Animal Care make sense in light of the revenue earned?

There will be minimal impact to revenue generation resulting from the elimination of the three vacant Animal Control Officer positions, as services to our contracted cities will not be directly impacted. In FY 10, despite these cuts, the revenue expected from Animal Care is expected to increase by \$156,668 to \$1,699,934, primarily as a result of the introduction of a new administrative citations process, and technological improvements.

- 9) What's the cost for alleys and street repair?

The approximate cost for asphalt street repairs includes slurry @ \$0.30/sf, resurfacing @ \$3.00/sf, and reconstruction @ \$6.50/sf. The approximate cost for concrete alley reconstruction is @ \$11.00/sf.

- 10) Provide an overview of Bixby Knoll Business Improvement District jurisdiction.

A response was provided under separate cover on September 4, 2009.

September 1, 2009 Budget Workshop

Public Works (PW))

11) Please detail the fixed versus variable costs associated with street sweeping.

The response to this request is provided in the context of changing the frequency of Street Sweeping from weekly to bi-weekly.

Estimated variable costs are approximately \$5.5 million. These include:

- Salaries for those positions that would be reduced by half for Motor Sweeper Operators and Parking Control Checkers (\$3.0M)
- Various materials and supplies expenses related to those positions - e. g., uniforms, autocite ribbons, radios, etc (\$\$.4M)
- Fleet expenses for the Parking Control Vehicles (\$2.1M)

Estimated fixed costs are approximately \$2.0M. These include:

- Salary for Street Sweeping and Parking Control Supervisors and extra drivers to handle disposal (approximately \$.2M). Supervision requirements would remain the same. Since more debris will be allowed to accumulate and 2 more drivers to handle disposal will be necessary.
- Disposal costs (\$.5M) are per ton and there would be no decrease in the total amount of debris tonnage.
- Liability (\$.1M)
- Lease payments for the street sweepers (\$1.2M)

Please see the table below indicating costs based on frequency.

Street Sweeping

	Weekly Sweeping	Bi-Weekly Sweeping
Cost for Street Sweeping Program	5,429,583*	4,376,890
Revenue (from MOUs and Special Events)	(224,226)	(224,226)
Net Cost for Street Sweeping	5,205,357	4,152,664
Cost for Parking Control Program	2,019,242	1,162,719
Citation Revenue	(9,100,000)	(4,550,000)
Net Cost for Parking Control	(7,080,758)	(3,387,281)
Net cost/(revenue) from program	(1,875,401)	765,383

* Calculation:

Street Sweeping Budget	5,429,583
Less Refuse Fund Transfer (per Nexus study)	(1,001,600)
Less Gas Tax Transfer	(1,608,788)
Net budget amount (slide 11)	2,819,195

Reducing street sweeping to every other week would not result in any net program savings as the corresponding parking citations written create net revenue for the General Fund.

12) What are the environmental impacts of reducing the frequency of street sweeping?

The primary goal of street sweeping is to protect public health and safety through the efficient removal of litter and other debris from City streets. Street sweeping is performed weekly on all city streets. This helps to keep our beaches and waterways clean by reducing the amount of debris that ends up in the storm drains. Approximately 26 million pounds of debris are removed from the City streets each year by our street sweepers.

As part of the City's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements, the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region, adopted a trash Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for the Los Angeles River. The TMDL establishes the amount of trash and debris the river can accept while still meeting water quality standards. This unfunded mandate requires the City to reduce and eventually eliminate trash from entering the river. The street sweeping program is a key component for the City meeting its NPDES requirements.

Trash not collected by the sweepers will end up in our storm drains and on our beaches. The cost for removing this material from storm drains and beaches is significantly more expensive than if collected by the street sweepers on a weekly basis. The environmental impacts of not sweeping means that trash, green waste (leaves, grass, and other vegetation), brake dust, animal waste, etc. deposited in our street gutters will make their way into the water ways and beaches harming wildlife and causing health problems to recreational users of our beaches and waterways.

13) Explain the difference between Engineering Bureau reduction of 3 FTE and the Budget Book's Engineering Program. Also, explain the increase in FTE for the Administration Program.

The FTE numbers in the budget book (p.433) represent the increase in the Engineering *Program*, whereas the budget presentation (slide 5) is showing the total FTEs reduction in the Engineering *Bureau*. The Engineering Program is one of the six programs in the Engineering Bureau. The difference between Engineering Bureau reduction of 3.00 FTE (slide 5) and the budget book Engineering Program increase of 7.24 FTEs is due to overall FTE changes within the six programs and the departmental reorganization.

The Administration Program includes administrative functions in the Engineering, Fleet, and Public Services Bureaus. The increase in the budget book (p. 430) reflects 2.66 FTE for Engineering and 1.00 FTE for Public Services. These include positions that were moved between Programs as a result of the Public Works reorganization. These Administration Program positions are included in the bureau's amounts in the budget presentation (slide 13) that includes the net operational reductions by bureau.

14) Please explain the expenses covered by the \$4 million for the Community Litter Abatement Program. What are the environmental impacts of reducing the frequency of street sweeping?

The Solid Waste Collection, Disposal and Recycling Line of Business includes the Litter Abatement and Community Support Program.

The total appropriation for FY 10 is \$4,533,080 and is budgeted in the Refuse and Recycling Fund (EF330). Of this budget, \$943,880 is for Litter Abatement and is funded through refuse/recycling rate revenue and \$125,000 in State grants. \$3,589,200 is for Community Support. Community Support programs are direct transfers from the Refuse/Recycling Fund (EF330) to support related and otherwise General Fund activities. Both grant funds and refuse/recycling rate revenue have strict spending restrictions.

Litter Abatement

The Litter Abatement activity totals \$943,880. Funding comes from the Refuse Fund (EF330). Revenue streams include refuse and recycling rate revenue, and \$125,000 in State grants. The Litter Abatement program funds various litter abatement activities within the City including:

- Neighborhood Cleanups – This activity uses City staff and community service workers (CSW) as litter clean-up crews. The program operates Tuesday through Saturday and utilizes an average of 24,000 CSW hours per year, which equates to approximately \$445,000 in value annually. Between 800 and 900 tons of debris are cleared from streets and alleys each year. These litter cleanup crews also support neighborhood cleanups organized by Council offices;
- Lunch with a Lizard – An educational litter abatement and awareness program for elementary aged youth. During the 2008 – 2009 school year, the program was delivered to 533 LBUSD classrooms comprised of 10,419 students. Since its inception, 23,988 students have participated;
- Public Education – Anti-litter campaigns such as our award winning “Litter-Free Long Beach” campaign, our interactive website, LBUSD “Litter Stinks” poster contest, and litter reduction support at special events and City functions.

Community Support

The \$3.59 million for Community Support consists of Refuse Fund support for otherwise General Fund expenditures for services that are related to refuse and recycling collection. The supporting revenue stream is refuse and recycling rates charged to customers.

Annual Refuse Fund supported community support includes:

- Police Department enforcement services as issuance of litter and scavenging citations (Police Department);
- Street sweeping program (Public Works);
- Vehicle impact on streets and alleys (Public Works);
- Storm drain maintenance (NPDES);
- Code Enforcement (Community Development);
- Sustainability commission (Development Services);
- Citywide newsletters (formerly the WAVE);
- Rental of space at Public Service yard (to be suspended);
- Community Beautification program (Community Development);
- Neighborhood Cleanup Assistance program (Community Development);
- Sustainability “Green Team” support (City Manager’s office)
- Citywide tree trimming disposal costs (Public Works);

- Litter Abatement promotion through various citywide events (various departments).

15) Why is the Towing Fund listed as endangered when the budgeted revenues are greater than expenditures?

The Towing fund has been on the "endangered" list due to FY 09 Towing revenue not meeting adopted budget. This is a direct result of a combination of decreased tow requests by customer departments and poor economic conditions that existed during FY 09. This combination has resulted in depressed revenue.

To mitigate this effect, the towing and storage rates were increased in April 2009, which should bring revenues up towards the budget. As well, to adjust for the changing economic environment, the towing operation implemented the new title surrender program, bringing the operation in line with industry standards and providing assistance to those citizens that are economically challenged. Towing management also adopted a pro-active approach to employee scheduling, better serving our user departments, reducing contract tow expenses and providing a timely on-scene response and more efficient service.

The Proposed FY10 budget represents budget reductions of \$415k, and full year of revenue with the increased fee rates, with an assumption of a return to normal towing levels. The towing operation will continue to implement changes to keep the overall budget positive and prevent the Towing Fund from being on the "endangered" list.

16) Please provide an update on Proposition L compliance regarding the building trades.

The specifications for Request for Proposals (RFP) for Painting, Carpentry and Locksmith trade services are being finalized. It is anticipated that the specifications will be released in October 2009. After proposals are received by the City, a Proposition L analysis will be performed comparing outside bids to City costs to determine if these services can be performed in a more cost effective manner to the City.

17) In the Community Report, Contingency Plan B (p. 22) are the proposed eliminated positions related to development vacant or filled?

<u>Position</u>	<u>Vacant FTEs</u>	
Trade Positions	4.0	
Clerical Aide II	0.5	
Traffic Engineering Assoc I & II	1.7	
Engineering Technician I	2.0	
Construction Inspector II	0.9	
Engineering Aide III	1.0	
Engineering Technician II	0.2	
Civil Engineering Associate	0.4	
Total Vacant FTEs	10.7	General Fund Positions

Position	Filled FTEs	
Trade Positions	11.0	
Traffic Signal Technician I	1.0	
Clerk Typist III	1.0	
Clerk Typist II	0.8	
Clerk Typist III	1.0	
Clerk Typist II	0.45	
1st Pothole crew	4.0	
2nd Pothole crew	4.0	
Total Filled FTEs	23.25	General Fund Positions
Total FTEs	33.95	

Tidelands

- 18) What is the status of the legislation approved in January that will enhance the Wilmington Oil Field and could potentially result in higher revenue as a result of higher prices and higher oil volume?

A response will be provided under separate cover.

- 19) Please explain the increase in the Public Works Department's Tidelands FY 10 budget.

In addition to the \$484,000 increase for water quality monitoring, PW's Tidelands budget increase is due to increases in general liability and worker's compensation allocation.

- 20) What is the feasibility of utilizing savings from consolidating Dive Teams to restore eliminated/reduced Tidelands items?

As diving is not a full-time duty for either police or fire, there are no immediate savings in personnel costs. The focus of the consolidation is in creating efficiencies in personnel training, dive equipment acquisition, dive equipment annual maintenance, and dive safety procedures.

- 21) Please provide a detailed list of all special events funded by the Tidelands funds.

There are only two types of special events held in the Tidelands area, parades in the amount of \$14,500 and the Municipal Band in the amount of \$153,753.

- 22) Can we charge business license tax based on square footage instead of the current practice of charging based on the number of employees in the Tidelands area?

Currently the Business License tax charges businesses in Long Beach a flat fee plus an additional \$15 per employee the business employs. For commercial businesses, i.e., rental of nonresidential property, such as the World Trade Center the business license tax is based on square footage of the commercial space. There is no distinction between the tax charged in the Tidelands area versus any other area of the City and therefore all of the revenue for business license tax is deposited into the General Fund. Currently the square footage is .034 cents per square footage and this amount is modified annually based on the annual CPI.

Changing the method by which the tax is determined requires a Prop 218 election.

September 1, 2009 Budget Hearing

- 23) Please detail how many employees have City vehicles and the total cost? What is the estimated savings from converting everyone to mileage reimbursement?

A response was provided under separate cover on September 2, 2009.

- 24) Please provide a complete list of all contracts, including amount and contractor title, for the offices of the City Auditor and City Attorney.

Included below are the current contracts for service with outside vendors for the City Auditor and the City Attorney. Please note that these amounts may reflect multi-year contracts.

AUDITOR

Vendor	Contract Amount
DAVIS GROUP CONSULTING INC	\$ 93,000
GCG ROSE & KINDEL	75,000
KPMG LLP	3,103,798
PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS LLP	75,000
SJOBERG EVASHENK CONSULTING INC	39,900
THOMPSON, JAMES	121,500
WHITE, EDWARD & CO	615,000
DS WATERS OF AMERICA INC	571
FEDAK, CHARLES Z	3,590
FEDEX KINKOS OFFICE AND PRINT SERVICES	51
LUMACHI, SHAUN R	18,000
OFFICE DEPOT INC	15,261
UNITED PARCEL SERVICES	-
TOTAL	\$ 4,160,672

CITY ATTORNEY

Vendor	Contract Amount
ATKINSON, ANDELSON, LOYA, RUDD & ROMO	\$ 75,000
BENDER, MATTHEW & CO INC	20,000
COLANTUONO & LEVIN, PC	75,000
EZRA, BRUTZKUS & GUBNER LLP	2,120,000
FEELEY, THOMAS P C	200,000
FERGUSON, PRAET & SHERMAN	300,000
FLOYD, SKEREN & KELLY, LLP	50,000
GROBSTEIN, HORWATH & CO LLP	650,000
GUERRA, TRACY	25,000
HABERBUSH & ASSOCIATES LLP	50,000
HOLLIDAY, STEPHEN B	25,000
IRON MOUNTAIN INFORMATION MGMT INC	35,000
KAISER & SWINDELLS, LAW FIRM OF	124,000
KAMM, WARREN E	30,000
LIEBERT CASSIDY WHITMORE	150,000
MEYERS, NAVE, RIBACK, SILVER & WILSON	695,000
PETERS, MICHAEL M	367,652
RICHARDS, WATSON & GERSHON	420,000
RUTAN & TUCKER, LLP	545,000
WEST PUBLISHING CORPORATION	35,000
ASPEN PUBLISHERS INC	5,594
OFFICE DEPOT INC	13,876
REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA	12,879
XEROX CORPORATION	301
TOTAL	\$ 6,024,301

25) Please provide a list of all vacant positions within the 312 total positions removed.

The list of vacant positions are listed in Attachment B.

For more information or further questions, please contact David Wodynski, Manager of the Budget and Performance Management Bureau, at extension 8-6688.

LAF:DW:JS

K:\BUDGET\FY 10\CC WORKSHOPS AND HEARINGS\SEPTEMBER 1, 2009\ RESPONSES TO AUG 31 QUESTIONS
ATTACHMENT

CC: SUZANNE FRICK, ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER
REGINALD HARRISON, DEPUTY CITY MANAGER
DEPARTMENT HEADS
JYL MARDEN, CITY COUNCIL LIAISON

Number of Contracts by Department

Department	# of contracts
AP	115
AU	14
CC	4
CD	90
CM	13
CP	11
CS	7
DV	59
EN	111
FD	101
FM	72
HA	460
HE	202
HR	7
LD	11
LS	22
LW	7
OP	15
PD	136
PR	410
PW	441
TS	154
WA	306
XC	16
TOTAL	2,784

All Funds Total Vacant Positions Eliminated

Attachment B

Dept	Position Title	FTEs	Loaded Cost
AP	SPEC SVCS OFCR II	(2.00)	(130,770)
CD	CLERK TYPIST II	(1.00)	(52,483)
CD	COMMUNITY WORKER - NC	(1.50)	(55,641)
CD	DEVELOPMENT PROJECT MANAGER II	(1.00)	(103,252)
CD	HUMAN DIGNITY OFFICER	(1.00)	(107,433)
CD	NEIGHBORHOOD SVCS SPEC I	(1.00)	(58,118)
CD	NEIGHBORHOOD SVCS SPEC III	(1.00)	(66,433)
CD	PROJECT MGMT OFFICER	(1.00)	(145,243)
CM	INVESTIGATOR - CITY MANAGER	(0.50)	(35,170)
DV	CHIEF BUILDING INSPECTOR	(1.00)	(114,347)
DV	CLERK TYPIST II	(1.00)	(52,490)
DV	COMBINATION BUILDING INSPECTOR AIDE II	(1.00)	(61,259)
DV	COMBINATION BUILDING INSPECTOR	(2.00)	(195,036)
DV	PLANNER I	(2.00)	(154,262)
DV	PLANNER III	(2.00)	(193,959)
DV	PRINCIPAL BUILDING INSPECTOR	(1.00)	(99,657)
DV	SENIOR COMBINATION BUILDING INSPECTOR	(1.00)	(99,801)
DV	SENIOR PLUMBING INSPECTOR	(1.00)	(88,920)
DV	STRUCTURAL ENGINEER	(1.00)	(119,234)
EN	MECHANICAL ENGINEER	(1.00)	(116,929)
FD	FIRE CAPTAIN	(2.00)	(322,821)
FD	FIREFIGHTER	(12.00)	(1,218,698)
FD	SAFETY SPECIALIST II	(1.00)	(89,531)
FM	CLERK TYPIST III	(1.00)	(65,716)
FM	CUSTOMER SERVICE REPRESENTATIVE II	(1.00)	(53,569)
HE	ANIMAL CONTROL OFFICER II	(3.00)	(185,838)
HE	BUS SYS SPEC II	(1.00)	(84,262)
HE	CASE MANAGER III	(2.13)	(141,068)
HE	CLERK TYPIST II	(1.00)	(63,833)
HE	CLERK TYPIST III	(1.00)	(68,321)
HE	CLERK TYPIST IV	(1.00)	(59,303)
HE	COMMUNITY WORKER	(2.00)	(109,142)
HE	ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SPECIALIST III	(1.00)	(82,453)
HE	HEALTH EDUCATOR I	(1.00)	(48,565)
HE	MAINTENANCE ASSISTANT I	(0.63)	(34,445)
HE	MEDICAL ASSISTANT I	(1.11)	(48,269)
HE	NURSE I	(1.00)	(92,600)
HE	NURSE PRACTITIONER	(1.00)	(104,527)
HE	OUTREACH WORKER I	(3.00)	(132,345)
HE	OUTREACH WORKER II	(4.90)	(319,741)
HE	PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATE I	(1.00)	(107,348)
HE	PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATE II	(4.50)	(251,024)
HE	PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATE III	(4.86)	(383,357)
HE	PUBLIC HEALTH NURSE II	(1.28)	(135,201)
HE	PUBLIC HEALTH NURSE SUPERVISOR	(0.10)	(9,870)
HE	PUBLIC HEALTH PHYSICIAN	(0.50)	(91,438)
HE	PUBLIC HEALTH PROFESSIONAL I	(1.00)	(80,621)
HE	PUBLIC HEALTH PROFESSIONAL II	(2.00)	(176,392)
HE	PUBLIC HEALTH PROFESSIONAL III	(1.00)	(94,275)
HR	PERSONNEL ASSISTANT (CONF) I	(1.00)	(63,405)
HR	PERSONNEL ASSISTANT (CONF) II	(1.00)	(67,893)
LD	ADMINISTRATIVE AIDE II	(0.40)	(39,247)
LS	GENERAL LIBRARIAN	(3.00)	(247,323)

All Funds Total Vacant Positions Eliminated

Attachment B

Dept	Position Title	FTEs	Loaded Cost
LS	LIBRARY CLERK I	(2.74)	(51,782)
LS	LIBRARY CLERK II	(1.00)	(68,085)
LS	MANAGER-BRANCH LIBRARY SERVICES	(1.00)	(128,465)
LS	SECRETARY	(1.00)	(72,362)
PD	ADMINISTRATIVE ANALYST II	(1.00)	(90,157)
PD	POLICE CORPORAL	(4.00)	(611,852)
PD	POLICE LIEUTENANT	(1.00)	(186,108)
PD	POLICE OFFICER	(10.00)	(1,352,246)
PD	SAFETY SPECIALIST I	(1.00)	(77,131)
PR	CAPITAL PROJECTS COORDINATOR	(1.00)	(118,735)
PR	CLERK TYPIST II	(2.00)	(109,698)
PR	EQUIPMENT OPERATOR II	(2.00)	(118,606)
PR	PARK DEV OFCR	(1.00)	(137,221)
PR	PARK NATURALIST	(1.00)	(67,718)
PR	RECREATION SUPERINTENDENT	(1.00)	(120,425)
PW	ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER-PUBLIC WORKS	(1.00)	(120,435)
PW	CIVIL ENGINEER	(2.00)	(227,893)
PW	ELECTRICIAN	(1.00)	(72,222)
PW	EQUIPMENT MECHANIC II	(1.00)	(86,233)
PW	FLEET SERVICES SUPERVISOR I	(1.00)	(80,621)
PW	GARAGE SERVICE ATTENDANT I	(3.00)	(170,284)
PW	GARAGE SVC ATTENDANT II-TOWING	(1.00)	(59,303)
PW	GEOGRAPHIC INFO SYSTEM TECHNICIAN II	(1.00)	(73,515)
PW	HELICOPTER MECHANIC	(1.00)	(94,025)
PW	MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT STOCK CLERK I	(1.00)	(66,434)
PW	MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT STOCK CLERK II	(1.00)	(61,946)
PW	MECHANICAL SUPERVISOR II	(1.00)	(86,233)
PW	PLUMBER	(1.00)	(72,222)
PW	SPEC SVCS OFCR II	(1.00)	(61,341)
PW	STOCK & RECEIVING CLERK	(1.00)	(50,249)
PW	SYSTEMS ANALYST II	(1.00)	(82,441)
PW	TRAFFIC ENGINEER	(1.00)	(113,946)
TS	ACCOUNTING CLERK III	(1.00)	(58,118)
TS	ADMINISTRATIVE ANALYST II	(1.00)	(90,144)
TS	BUS SYS SPEC II	(2.00)	(168,524)
TS	BUS SYS SPEC III	(1.00)	(110,699)
TS	BUS SYS SPEC V	(2.00)	(221,190)
TS	COMM SPECIALIST I	(1.00)	(75,409)
TS	COMM SPECIALIST IV	(1.00)	(121,550)
TS	SYSTEMS TECHNICIAN I	(1.00)	(63,604)
WA	MANAGER-ENGINEERING PLANNING/DEV SVCS	(1.00)	(163,739)
WA	WATER UTILITY MECHANIC II	(2.00)	(141,560)
GRAND TOTAL		(151.15)	(13,227,350)